```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
2
                    FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4
                     Plaintiff,
                                        ) No. 6:05-60008-2-HO
5
       V.
6
     PIROUZ SEDAGHATY, et al.,
7
                     Defendants.
8
9
                TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE
10
              BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL R. HOGAN
11
                UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
12
                        TUESDAY, MAY 4, 2010
13
                           EUGENE, OREGON
14
15
16
                                -:-
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
                     Deborah Wilhelm, CSR, RPR
                           Court Reporter
24
                           P.O. Box 1504
                         Eugene, OR 97440
25
                           (541) 431-4113
```

1		APPEARANCES	OF COUNSEL VIA TELEPHONE
2			
3	FOR TH	E PLAINTIFF:	CHRISTOPHER L. CARDANI United States Attorney's Office
4			405 E. 8th Avenue, Suite 2400 Eugene, OR 97401
5			(541) 465-6771 chris.cardani@usdoj.gov
6			CHARLES F. GORDER, JR.
7			United States Attorney's Office 1000 S.W. Third Avenue, Suite 600
8			Portland, OR 97204-2902 (503) 727-1021
9			
10	FOR TH	E DEFENDANT:	LAWRENCE H. MATASAR Lawrence Matasar, P.C.
11			621 S.W. Morrison Street Suite 1025
12			Portland, OR 97205 (503) 222-9830
13			larry@pdxlaw.com
14			STEVEN T. WAX Federal Public Defender
15			101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 1700 Portland, OR 97204
16			(503) 326-2123 steve wax@fd.org
17			steve_wakerd.org
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

```
(Tuesday, May 4, 2010; 9:40 a.m.)
1
2
        (The following proceedings were had in chambers.)
                      PROCEEDINGS
3
             THE CLERK: Now is the time set for Criminal
 4
5
    Case 05-60008, United States of America versus Pirouz
    Sedaghaty, time set for in chambers conference regarding
6
7
    timing and scheduling for the May 10, 2010, hearing.
8
             THE COURT: Good morning. The first question I
    have for the defendant is do you waive the defendant's
9
10
    presence?
11
             MR. WAX: Yes, Your Honor.
             MR. MATASAR: Yes.
12
13
             MR. WAX: That was Steve Wax speaking.
             THE COURT: Okay. Steve, I've set this little
14
15
    phone hearing because of your e-mail to me. Actually,
16
    it was to Mary Pat, I guess, but that's a good way to
17
    talk to me. And I'm happy to tell you about your plans.
18
    I'd like to know what you have in mind, however.
19
             MR. WAX: Well, we -- if we understand
20
    correctly, the government will have Evan Kohlmann
21
    available to testify at the Daubert challenge that we
22
    have filed against him, so we would think that would be
23
    one order of business.
24
             We filed, which I assume Scooter has gotten to
25
    everyone, a number of pleadings that we would like to
```

take up. We have a -- you know, the motions in limine and a number of sub issues within that. We have an open issue with respect to the scope of the disclosures made in the witness and exhibit lists, and the issue we raised about, you know, direct case versus rebuttal, et cetera.

The government has indicated that, before you were able to join the call, that they are planning on filing a *Daubert* challenge to Colonel Lang, so that's the list of some of the things that we see.

We have not yet filed any voir dire motions.

We plan on doing that. And one, in particular, I think might be good for us to discuss, at least preliminarily, and that would involve jury questionnaire and timing of such.

THE COURT: All right. All of you know quite a lot about me. I'm not an unknown quantity to you. And you all know -- well, maybe you don't know. I've only used a jury questionnaire one time in 28 years, and that had to do with whether there was sexual abuse in families of jurors, and so I thought that merited discussion in camera. So I don't do that very often. I'm happy to consider it.

Mr. Cardani and Mr. Gorder, did you want to talk about the scope of the Monday hearing?

MR. GORDER: Yes, Your Honor. This is Charles Gorder. I do want to confirm that we'll be filing a Daubert motion on the disclosures of Mr. Lang's purported expert testimony at the trial, and we'll file that today. So we would like to have that heard if we could.

I just really have one request with regard to Mr. Kohlmann, and I assume the defense would join with regard to Mr. Lang, is that perhaps we could take those issues up first in the hearing so that we could get our witnesses out of town and back home, you know, at a reasonable time.

But beyond that, I think the other issues that are pending are the exhibits that both sides are challenging, so we have that issue too on Monday.

THE COURT: All right. Well, anything more, and then I'll tell you what I have in mind?

MR. CARDANI: Judge, Chris Cardani. I've been taking some notes here, and there is just a couple of other things. The last thing Mr. Gorder mentioned, the exhibits, there have been extensive challenges on both sides, so there may be a need for the court to get really involved in an exhibit review, and call balls and strikes, which would help both of us shape the trial and make it more efficient.

And then the last thing is I brought up this issue at the last hearing about our need for stipulations on some documents that we obtained from Mr. Matasar in response to a grand jury subpoena. And we have not made any official progress on that. I talked to Mr. Matasar again yesterday, and he said he's going to speak to Mr. Wax today and let me know. But I'm getting a little apprehensive. And if we aren't able to arrange stipulations, I need to file a motion this week to get this on for Monday as well to get some movement on the admissibility of those documents.

THE COURT: Well, you folks try to work that out today. And if you don't, file your motion.

MR. CARDANI: Okay.

THE COURT: Now, Counsel, on Daubert

challenges, some people in the South call them Dobare

challenges, especially from Louisiana, but I think

that's probably not it. At any rate, on those, lots of

times the materials to be reviewed involve a pretty

substantial amount of written material. And if either

of you are going to be relying on written material, I'd

like you to get that to me early so that I could have it

read. And so give me a few days to do that. All right.

Then my plan is, right now I've got the entire Monday open. I don't hear enough here that would

```
1
    require more than just Monday, and so we'll plan on
2
    doing everything Monday.
             Just so that you know, I'm going to Washington,
3
    D.C. on the 18th. If there is any further work that you
4
    have in mind, that either of you have in mind, that I
5
    should be doing in Washington, D.C., then, please let me
6
7
    know in an appropriate way, because I plan on doing some
8
    review to make sure I feel confident in the rulings
    which we'll have at trial. And I'll probably be doing
9
10
    any reviews I do on the 19th.
11
             All right. That being said, what else do you
    have, folks?
12
13
             MR. GORDER: Your Honor, can I ask if the court
    security officer is going to be in Eugene on Monday?
14
15
             THE COURT: Yes.
16
             MR. GORDER: Okay.
17
             THE COURT: Because I've already informed him
    that I'd like him here.
18
19
             MR. GORDER: Okay. Your Honor, I do think
20
    that, at least preliminarily, I would like to address
21
    you in camera on the CIPA filings that defense counsel
22
    filed last week. Can't really talk about that on this
23
    telephone, but --
24
             THE COURT: Are you in Eugene today?
25
             MR. GORDER: No, I'm in Portland, I'm sorry.
```

```
1
             THE COURT: All right. Well --
             MR. WAX: I'm sorry, was that a request for an
2
3
    ex parte discussion?
             THE COURT: That's what I --
 4
             MR. WAX: Because I'm quite concerned about,
5
6
    you know, following the CIPA, you know, Section 6
7
    procedures. I mean, we have filed, you know, formal
8
    notice and we have filed also some pretty extensive
    motions that we believe require a formal response from
9
10
    the government, and a discussion that is not ex parte,
    you know, in a classified session.
11
12
             THE COURT: You'll have to take your own
13
    counsel on that, both of you. If either of you believe
14
    you are entitled to an ex parte session, then take
15
    whatever steps you need to request it. And I will have
16
    reviewed the CIPA filing. Anything further?
17
             MR. WAX: Judge, with respect to Colonel
18
    Lang --
19
             THE COURT: Yes.
20
             MR. WAX: -- we don't yet have the government's
21
    pleading. We intend to have him there on Monday if that
22
    is what you want. I don't know, when we see their
23
    pleading, if we're going to be suggesting that there is
24
    just no need to have him. I mean, his credentials, as
25
    we see it, are impeccable. And I'm not sure quite what
```

```
1
    the government is planning on doing, but we do need to
2
    know whether we should have him there because there are
3
    logistic and expense issues that we have to contend
    with.
 4
             THE COURT: If a motion is filed by tomorrow,
5
 6
    you should have him at the hearing.
7
             MR. WAX: Okay.
8
             THE COURT: Anything further?
             MR. MATASAR: Yes, Your Honor. I think it's
9
10
    probably better for all concerned to -- if it's okay
11
    with you, Chris, to address the general issue that we've
12
    been talking about with the business records, just alert
1.3
    the judge.
14
             MR. CARDANI: Okay.
15
             MR. MATASAR: Does that sound agreeable?
16
             MR. CARDANI:
                           Yes.
17
             MR. MATASAR: Your Honor, there is a series of
18
    documents that the government has proposed be
19
    introduced. They all have the AHIF prefix. And those
20
    are documents that were obtained by the government
21
    pursuant to a subpoena long before the indictment.
                                                         They
22
    served a subpoena on al-Haramain, and I was then
23
    retained. I was in contact with Mr. Cardani.
24
    provided him with several boxes of documents pursuant to
2.5
    the subpoena.
```

2.5

These documents, which he has received, he has sought to introduce some of them, and has indicated that he wants to consider them as business records, and has indicated that if we, in short -- and I think this is a fair way to describe it -- if we don't stipulate that they are business records, he intends to call me as a witness to assist in the authentication of the business records because I provided the records to him.

My response is generally that I certainly would not dispute the fact that I am in a chain of custody; that as a lawyer pursuant to a government subpoena, I provided him with documents. However, I'm not sure that gets him to the business records exception in the hearsay rule. So that's in general what we're talking about.

And Mr. -- Chris has indicated, you know, that he feels the documents are important to his case. And Mr. Wax and I plan to meet in detail today and tomorrow, but that is the general issue that you may be faced with on Monday as well.

MR. CARDANI: And this is Chris Cardani. I have no desire of calling Mr. Matasar as a witness,

Judge. But if we can't get a stipulation that gets us closer to being able to get over the -- the defense has challenged a number of these exhibits, and we can talk

2.5

about that Monday at the hearing. And if we're not able to get a suitable custodian of records and lay the proper foundation for these documents, it may be because of how these documents were obtained by the government that Mr. Matasar may need to answer some questions outside the jury, of course this would be a pretrial hearing. I don't want to do that. I want to avoid that. And that's why we're having these discussions.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. WAX: Judge, there is one other logistical issue that exists for Monday. The pleadings that we filed through the court security officer are not in our possession. And if we're bringing Colonel Lang out on -- for Monday, I'm going to need access to those documents with him on Sunday, which I guess is an issue more for the U.S. Attorney's Office than for the court, perhaps, because the documents exist in the -- or are being held in the U.S. Attorney's Office. And we will then need them in the courtroom on Monday. And I don't believe the court security officer will allow us to transport them. So we just want to alert you that in terms of hearing preparation, I need access to them Sunday in Portland, and then they need to be brought to the courtroom for our use in court on Monday.

THE COURT: The only question I have about

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

```
that, I think it would be easier to make them available
on Sunday in Eugene. And so I want you folks to talk
about that, all right?
         MR. WAX: Well, in terms of our expert, Judge,
we would be wasting four hours of driving time if we
have to go down to Eugene and back on Sunday and then
back again on Monday.
         THE COURT: I understand.
         MR. WAX: I had assumed the U.S. Attorney,
Mr. Gorder, is authorized to transport -- I mean, these
materials are kept in a locked bag to which Mr. Matasar,
Mr. Teesdale and I have, at least as I understand it,
the only key. I have no problem with Mr. Gorder, you
know, bringing them to the courtroom on Monday.
         MR. MATASAR: Doesn't Scooter have copies of
these documents? Wouldn't he be bringing his own copies
to court?
         MR. GORDER: Steve, maybe this is something we
can talk off line about.
         MR. WAX: Well, I just want to be sure that we
will have access to the documents both in Portland for
work with the expert, and, yes, the court, of course,
has copies of them.
         THE COURT: I do have them here in the safe.
         MR. WAX: Yeah. So if we'd be able to have
```

```
access to them, you know --
1
2
             THE COURT: But I'm not going to take them to
    Portland.
3
4
             MR. WAX: No, no, no. I'm not asking you to
5
    take them to Portland. We have copies in the safe in
6
    the U.S. Attorney's Office in Portland.
7
             MR. MATASAR: In Portland.
8
             MR. WAX: We just need to have access to them
    in Eugene as well during the hearing on Monday.
9
10
             THE COURT: You fellas try to work that out.
11
    And with regard to Portland, there is not much I'm going
12
    to do. With regard to Eugene, if I have to come down,
    we'll make them available. If I have to get Scooter out
13
    here, we'll make them available.
14
15
             MR. WAX: We'll get back to you if we have an
16
    issue then.
17
             THE COURT: Thank you. Anything further?
18
    Thank you very much. See you on Monday.
19
             MR. GORDER: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
             (The proceedings were concluded at 9:57 a.m.)
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Deborah Wilhelm, Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of Oregon, do hereby certify that I was present at and reported in machine shorthand the oral proceedings had in the above-entitled matter. I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my skill and ability, dated this 22nd day of September, 2011.

/s/ Deborah Wilhelm

Deborah Wilhelm, RPR Certified Shorthand Reporter Certificate No. 00-0363